

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JONATHAN BERRY,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:18-CV-594-ECM
)	[WO]
DOTHAN CITY JAIL MEDIC JESSE,)	
<i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action on June 21, 2018. When he filed this complaint, Plaintiff was incarcerated at the Houston County Jail in Dothan, Alabama. On August 23, 2018, Defendants filed a notice with the court stating that Plaintiff had been released from custody of the Sheriff of Houston County. Doc. 21. Additionally, on August 27, 2018, the envelopes containing Plaintiff's copies of orders filed August 17, 2018, were returned to the court marked as undeliverable because Plaintiff is no longer at the service address he provided when he filed the complaint.

An order was entered on August 28, 2018, requiring that by September 7, 2018, Plaintiff file with the court a current address and/or show cause why this case should not be dismissed for his failure to adequately prosecute this action. Doc. 22. This order specifically advised Plaintiff this case could not proceed if his whereabouts remained unknown and cautioned him that his failure to comply with its directives would result in the dismissal of this case. *Id.* Plaintiff's copy of the August 28 order was returned to the court September 4, 2018, marked as undeliverable.

The foregoing reflects Plaintiff's lack of interest in the continued prosecution of this case. This action cannot proceed properly in Plaintiff's absence. The court, therefore, concludes this

case is due to be dismissed. *See Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (As a general rule, where a litigant has been forewarned, dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion.).

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge this case be DISMISSED without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure to comply with the orders of this court and to prosecute this action.

It is further

ORDERED that **on or before October 4, 2018**, the parties may file an objection to the Recommendation. Any objection filed must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which a party object. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court.

Failure to file a written objection to the proposed findings and recommendations in the Magistrate Judge's report shall bar a party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of factual findings and legal issues covered in the report and shall "waive the right to challenge on appeal the district court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions" except upon grounds of plain error if necessary in the interests of justice. 11th Cir. R. 3-1; *see Resolution Trust Co. v. Hallmark Builders, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir. 1993); *Henley v. Johnson*, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989).

Done, on this the 21st day of September, 2018.

/s/ Susan Russ Walker
Susan Russ Walker
United States Magistrate Judge